

For Sale.

MacEwen, FRICKEL & Co.
No. 13, Queen's Road East,
(OPPOSITE THE COMMISSARIAT),
ARE NOW LANDING, EX
BRITISH BARQUE
"STILLWATER."

DEVOS'S NONPAREIL
BRILLIANT
KEROSENE OIL,
150° test.

SPARTAN COOKING
STOVES.

FAIRBANKS SCALES.

OAKUM.

TAR.

TURPENTINE.

EX "AMERICAN MAIL"

CALIFORNIA

RACKER

COMPANY'S BISCUITS in 5 lb

tin, and loose.

Alphabetical BIS-

CUITS.

Fancy Sweet Mixed

BISCUITS.

Ginger CAKES.

Soda BISCUITS.

Oyster BISCUITS.

Cracked WHEAT.

OATMEAL.

HOMINY.

CORNMEAL.

TOPOCAN BUTTER.

Eastern and Californian CHEESE.

Boneless CODFISH.

Prime HAM and BACON.

Eagle Brand Condensed MILK.

PEACH and APPLE BUTTER.

Pickled ONION RINGS.

Family PIG-PORK in logs and pieces.

Paragon MACKEREL in 5 lb cans.

Beau Ideal SALMON in 5 lb cans.

Cutting's Dessert FRUITS in 24 hours.

"Assorted Canned VEGETABLES."

"Potted SAUSAGE and Sausage

MEAT."

"Assorted PEPPERS."

"Assorted PICKLES."

"MINCEMEAT."

COMB HONEY in Original Frames.

Richardson & Robinson's Celebrated Potted

MEATS.

Richardson & Robinson's Cured OYSTERS.

Lunch TONGUE.

McCurry's Sugar LEMONADE.

Clam CROWDER.

Smoked SALMON.

Green TURTLE in 2 1/2 lb cans.

Do., do., do., do., do., do., do., do., do., do.,

A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF STORES,

including:

TEYSSONNEAU'S DESSERT FRUITS

ALMONDS and RAISINS.

PICNIC TONGUES.

COCOATINA.

VAN HOUTEN'S COCOA.

LIBBY'S & EPP'S COCOA.

FRENCH PLUMS.

PATE DE FOIE GRAS.

MINCEMEAT.

SAUSAGES.

BRAWN.

ISIGNY BUTTER.

DANISH BUTTER.

BREAKFAST TONGUES.

ANCHOVIES.

ASPARAGUS.

SOUPS, &c.

WINES AND SPIRITS.

CHAMPAGNES—

HEIDEN'S MONOPOLE & WHITE

JULES CLICQUOT PONSARDIN.

JEVIE MUMM & Co., pints & quarts.

CLARETS—

CHATEAU MARGAUX.

CHATEAU LA ROSE, pints & quarts.

CHATEAU LAFFITE, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

CHATEAU LAURENT, " "

Mails.



STEAM FOR
SINGAPORE, PENANG,
COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ, PORT SAID,
MALTA, GIBRALTAR, BRINDISI,
ANCONA, VENICE, AND
LONDON;

ALSO,

BOMBAY, MADRAS, CALCUTTA, AND

AUSTRALIA.

N.B.—Cargo can be taken on through Bills

of Lading for BATAVIA, PERSIAN

GULF PORTS, MARSEILLES,

TRIESTE, HAMBURG, NEW YORK

AND BOSTON.

Cargo will be received on board until

Noon on the day previous.

Parcels and Specie (Gold) at the Office

until Noon on the day previous.

For further Particulars, regarding

RIGHTS and PASSAGE, apply to the

PENINSULAR and ORIENTAL STEAM

NAVIGATION COMPANY'S Office, Hongkong.

The Contents and Value of Packages are

required to be declared prior to shipment.

Shippers are particularly requested to

note the terms and conditions of the Com-

pany's Black Bills of Lading.

—This Steamship will call at COLOMBO.

A. McIVER, Superintendent.

Hongkong, August 7, 1892. au18

BRITISH MAIL STEAMSHIP

COMPANY.

STEAM TO NAGASAKI AND KOBE,

VIA INLAND SEA.

(Taking Cargo for YOKOHAMA and

VLADIVOSTOK.)

THE S. S. NIGATA MARU, Captain

WYNN, will be despatched as above

on FRIDAY, the 18th August, at 4 p.m.

Cargo received on board and Parcels at

the Office up to 1 p.m. of day of sailing.

No Bill of Lading signed under \$2

Freight.

All Claims for Damage must be settled

on board before delivery is taken, otherwise

they will not be recognized.

Cargo and Passengers for Yokohama

will be transhipped to the Shanghai Mail

Steamer at Kobe, and for Vladivostok at

Nagasaki.

For further Particulars, apply at the

Company's Office, Praya Central, Ground

Floor of Messrs Russell & Co.

H. J. H. TRIPP,

Agent.

Hongkong, August 8, 1892. au18

Occidental & Oriental Steam-

Ship Company.

TAKING CARGO AND PASSENGERS

TO JAPAN, THE UNITED

STATES, MEXICO, CENTRAL AND

SOUTH AMERICA, AND EUROPE,

VIA

THE OVERLAND RAILWAYS,

AND

ATLANTIC & OTHER CONNECTING

STEAMERS.

THE S. S. GAELIC will be despatched

for San Francisco via Yokohama, on

TUESDAY, the 22nd August, 1892, at

Noon.

Connection being made at Yokohama

with Steamers from Shanghai and Japan

ports.

All Parcel Packages should be marked to

address in full; and same will be received

at the Company's Office, until 5 p.m. the

day previous to sailing.

A Reduction of 25 % made on all

RETURN PASSAGE ORDERS ISSUED.

Consular Invoices to accompany Over-

land, Mexican, Central and South American

Cargo, should be sent to the Company's

Offices addressed to the Collector of Customs,

San Francisco.

For further information as to Freight

or Passage apply to the Agency of the

Company, No. 50A, Queen's Road Central.

CHAS. D. HARMAN,

Acting Agent.

Hongkong, August 9, 1892. au22

NOTICE.

COMPAGNIE DES MESSEGERIES

MARITIMES.

PAQUEBOTS POSTE FRANCAIS.

STEAM FOR

SAIGON, SINGAPORE, BATAVIA,

COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ, ISMAILIA,

PORT SAID, SYRIAN PORTS,

NAPLES, MARSEILLES, AND PORTS

OF BRAZIL, AND LA PLATA;

ALSO,

BOMBAY, MAHE, ST. DENIS, AND

PORT LOUIS.

ON THURSDAY, the 24th of August,

1892, at Noon, the Company's S. S.

GAZELLE, Commandant ROILLAND,

with MAILO, PASSENGERS, SPOULE,

and CARGO, will leave this Port for the

above places.

Cargo and Specie will be registered for

London as well as for Marseilles, and accepted

in transit through Marseilles for the

Insurances.

NOTICE.

QUEEN FIRE INSURANCE COM-

PANY.

THE Undersigned are prepared to accept

Claims on First Class Godowns at 1

per cent. nett premium per annum.

NORTON & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, May 19, 1891.

THE TOKIO MARINE INSURANCE

COMPANY, LIMITED.

THE MITSU BISHI MAIL S. S. CO.

having been appointed AGENTS for

the above Company, the Undersigned is

prepared to accept MARINE RISKS at

Current Rates and usual Discounts.

H. J. H. TRIPP,

Agent, M. B. M. S. S. Co.

Hongkong, April 20, 1892. oc27

Intimations.

NEWS FOR HOME.

The Overland China Mail.

(The oldest Overland Paper in China.)

PUBLISHED at the "CHINA MAIL" OFFICE

in TIME FOR THE ENGLISH MAIL.

Containing from 72 to 84 columns of closely-

printed matter.

THIS Mail Summary is compiled from

the Daily China Mail, is published

twice a month on the morning of the

English Mail's departure, and is a re-

cord of each fortnight's current history

of events in China and Japan, con-

tributed in original reports and collated

from the journals published at the various

ports in those countries.

It contains Shipping news from Shanghai,

Hongkong, Canton, &c., and a complete

Commercial Summary.

LOCAL AND GENERAL.

The next *AMERICAN MAIL*, per the C. & O. S. S. Co.'s steamer *Gladie*, may be expected on or about Tuesday, the 16th inst. She brings dates up to the 15th July.

The next *ENGLISH MAIL*, per the P. & O. steamer *Felix*, may be expected to arrive here to-morrow, the 16th inst. She brings mails up to the 14th July.

TELEGRAMS for Bangkok can go forward by mail closing at Singapore at 1 p.m. to-morrow, the 16th inst.

The *Beatrice* left the Commercial Dock to-day, and the *Olympia* went in. The *Japania* and *Yamato* went to Aberdeen to-day.

The Agents (Messrs. Adamson, Bell & Co.) inform us that the steamship *Stirling Castle*, from London, will leave Singapore to-morrow, the 16th inst., for Hongkong.

The Agents (Messrs. Jardine Matheson & Co.) inform us that the Indo-China S. N. Co.'s S.S. *Kwongsang*, from London for this port and Shanghai, is to leave Singapore to-morrow.

A JAPANESE paper is responsible for the assertion that Mr. Birgham, United States Minister at Tokyo, has expressed regret that the Korean Treaty was not made through the medium of Japan. Many Americans, says the same authority, are of opinion that they have been entrapped by the intrigues of Li Hung-chang.—*N. C. Daily News*.

We (*Courier*) hear that a French Opera Bouffe Company will appear in Shanghai about the end of August. The Company, which is a very strong one, numbering 28, has been playing in Manila, Saigon, and other places in the East with great success. The repertoire consists of 22 pieces, and we are given to understand that there will be a change of performance every evening.

The steamship *Penedo* (Capt. Kenderdine) reports that on the evening of 31st July, while on the voyage from Iloilo to Saigon, the wreck of a barque was observed, sunk in about nine fathoms, on the bank at the south-east end of the island of Pomeran, in Balabac Straits. The barque, which had evidently not been long sunk, as the sails were still on the yards, had white masts and yards, and her lower yards were in the water. As the weather was fine and clear, Capt. Kenderdine concluded that the crew had landed on Balabac Island, distant about eight miles.

The S. S. *Aberdeen*, of the Aberdeen line, which has been lying at Shanghai for some considerable time leaves for home shortly. It is expected she will have to "drive" all the way home so as to get out to Australia in time to bring home wool for the February sales in London. The engines of this vessel are on a new and peculiar principle, and are known as Kirk's triple expansion pressure. There are three cylinders—a high, medium, and low pressure—and these expand the steam from a working pressure of 125 lbs., and indicate 2,700-horse power. The boilers are steel, and double ended, and are fitted with corrugated furnaces, of which there are 12. On the last voyage out to Australia previous to visiting China a speed of twelve knots per hour was maintained with a daily expenditure of 36 tons of coal, and her average run per day from the Cape to the Australian coast was 302.4 miles. It is expected that going home she will maintain an average speed of 12 knots, making the voyage from Foochow in about 40 days. Messrs. Adamson and Bell are the agents of the vessel here.

Much has been said and written about the culpable neglect of Hongkong officials regarding so-called slavery; and it may not be out of place to note a case which came to our knowledge the other day, which fairly illustrates the action usually taken by officials here in matters wherein money is said to pass for what some people are so fond of terming "human flesh." The late Hon. Charles May, who was certainly the most experienced Police Magistrate that Hongkong has ever had, was wont to deal with such cases in the common-sense manner in which the instance we now detail was arranged; and we dare say the Hon. James Russell will bear out the statement, that such has been the rule invariably followed during the time when they occupied the magisterial bench. It appears that a girl was "purchased," as it is called, at the age of thirteen to a woman in Hongkong, and that she had been reared as a servant until she reached the age of eighteen. The foster-mother had advanced the sum of \$16 to the real mother of the girl, and everything seemed to be satisfactory until the other day, when a man, lodging in the same house, seems to have fallen in love with the fair damsel. The girl leaves the house of her foster-mother, and starts life in another part of the town. This arrangement, however, did not last very long; a reward leads to their discovery, for which service the foster-mother pays the sum of \$15, making a total of \$31 in hard cash which the girl had cost her foster-mother, not to mention upkeep, for five years. The real mother, who lives in the country, having been informed of the state of things, mortgages her house and comes into Hongkong with the proceeds for the purpose of redeeming her daughter; and the parties are all taken to the Registrar-General's Office, upon an all-round complaint. It seems

that the foster-mother had arranged that the girl should be married, but the love-affair with the lodger had upset that arrangement. The girl expressed her desire to go back to her own mother, and she was of course told that she could do so; but then, came the matter of the dollars, which the mother had anticipated by the sale of her property. We may fancy the mother's surprise when she was informed that the redemption of her daughter would cost her nothing—that she was not obliged to pay a cent. Doubtless it would seem as hard for the foster-mother as it was puzzling and pleasant to the real mother; but here the law of personal liberty comes in, as we believe it has always been applied in every similar case that came under the cognizance of local officials, and the girl was told she was free to go wherever she pleased, without regard to any money transactions that may have been entered into. The foster-mother would doubtless feel that investments in "human flesh" were by no means secure under English law; but that is precisely the lesson which ought to be taught in a British Colony. Not a syllable is mentioned of cruel treatment in connection with this illustration; and we are inclined to think that the case is a common one in the history of the Colony. The only one of the party who probably felt aggrieved was the foster-mother, who must have lost heavily by the transaction, unless, indeed, the real mother had carried her morality further than the law permits, and afterwards paid the foster-mother the redemption money which, in a Chinese sense, she clearly owed her.

According to telegraphic information received in Shanghai to-day (10th) a typhoon was raging yesterday in the Formosa Channel. A second telegram dated Aug. 11th, 9.30 a.m., intimates that the typhoon proceeded toward the mainland south of Amoy last night.—*Courier*.

We heard some time ago that the Government of Hongkong had withdrawn their permission to the Great Northern Telegraph Company to lay submarine cables for telephones in Hongkong harbour. It appears that H.M.'s Government took umbrage at the attempt of the Danish Company, whose connection with Russian interests is perfectly well-known to them, not only to obtain the exclusive right to lay lines to the different treaty ports, but also to procure the cancellation of rights to lay cables which had been granted to British subjects twelve years ago. These attempts of the Great Northern Company were successfully defeated by the prompt action of the English, American, and other Ministers in Peking.—*N. C. D. News*.

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR ARCHIBALD ALISON, Bart., K.C.B., who is in command of the troops landed at Alexandria, is the Chief of the English Intelligence Department. He has seen much service, and has a high reputation in the army. He entered the service in 1846, and served in the Crimea with the 72nd Highlanders, obtaining his brevet majority on the fall of Sebastopol. During the Indian Mutiny he acted as Military Secretary to Lord Clyde, and was severely wounded at the battle of Lucknow. He was awarded a baronetcy in 1860, and the Companion of the Bath at the close of the war. In 1875 he accompanied Sir Garnet Wolseley as Second-in-Command of the expeditionary force to Ashantee, and led the European brigades in the various actions of that campaign. He was then knighted by Parliament and received the K. C. B. for his services.—*Pioneer*.

The China Navigation Co.'s S. S. *Poohoo*, Captain Clegg, reports—Left Swatow, 26th July; had moderate northerly wind and clear weather; arrived at Amoy on 30th; left 4.35 p.m. on the 31st. At 5.40, anchored in Amoy Outer Harbour on account of threatening weather, barometer falling; wind, N.E. At 10.45 p.m. bar. rising and weather clearing, wind S.W.; weighed anchor and proceeded. At 3.30 a.m. on the 1st instant, when at Dedei a.m., left, weather commenced to get thick and breeze increasing. Steered course for Ockee, 10.30, bar falling, and meeting heavy N.E. sea, ship labouring heavily, and taking water over all; concluding that a typhoon was raging to the northward of us, hoisted ship to head S.W. At 2.00 a.m. of the 2nd, bar. rising and sea moderating; voyaged ship away again on her course. At 7.45 a.m. on 2nd, N.E. sea, and bar. falling; again hoisted to head S.W.; wind S.W.; terrific squalls and mountainous sea. At 4 a.m. on the 3rd, bar. rising and weather moderating; kept the steamer away on her course. At 5.16 a.m. on the 5th, sighted the 5th light, and at 5.10 p.m. passed through Bullock Harbour, strong northerly gale and high sea. At 6.40 passed Pasheda-hoek; very heavy easterly swell. Passed through Steep Island Pass at 11.40 p.m. on the 5th; Gutzlaff at 7.30 a.m., and arrived at Shanghai 5.30 p.m. on the 6th.—*Mercury*.

HONGKONG AND WHAMPOA DOCK COMPANY, LIMITED.

The following is the Report of the Board of Directors of the Hongkong and Whampoa Dock Company, Limited, to be presented at the Ordinary half-yearly Meeting of Shareholders, to be held at the Offices of the Company, No. 14, Praya, Hongkong, on Monday, the 22nd August, 1892, at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Gentlemen,—The Directors have now to submit to you their Report with a Statement of Accounts for the half-year ending the 30th June last.

The total receipts for the six months are \$47,623.80, and the net profits, after paying interest due and all charges, amount to \$85,708.90.

To which has to be added the Balance brought forward from account \$3,180.53

making available for appropriation \$89,797.43

from which have to be deducted—

Directors' fees \$3,500

Auditors' fees 250

\$3,750.00

\$86,047.43

The Directors recommend that a dividend of 4 per cent., \$50,000, be paid to the Shareholders, a bonus of \$10,000 to Con-

tributing Shareholders, \$10,000 be written off the value of Machinery, Tugs and Steam Launches, \$22,438.27 be placed to Reserve Fund, and the balance of \$2,763.16 be carried to the new account of H.M. Navy.

The Reserve Fund will thus be increased to \$170,000, of which the Directors propose to appropriate a sum of \$152,000 to write off the value of the Aberdeen Docks, which will then stand in the books at \$380,000.

The Tug, *Pilot Fish*, and two Steam Launches have been sold during the half year.

The Patent Slip has been put up at Kowloon and proves a valuable addition thereto.

The Plant and Machinery at the various establishments are all in good working order, and no improvement is being introduced where required by the erection and extension of workshops and supplies of new machinery and tools from home.

The Directors are engaged in negotiations with the British Admiralty for the construction of a Dock at Kowloon capable of receiving the largest ships of H.M. Navy.

The agreement is not yet signed, but the Directors have every reason to expect that the negotiations will be brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

H. HOPKINS, Chairman.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TURNKEYS AND THEIR WAGES.

To the Editor of the "CHINA MAIL."

Tuesday, Aug. 15.

Sir,—The question of the Administrator and the answer of Mr. Hayward, the Acting Superintendent of the Civil Commission, proposed increase to assistant turnkeys has brought to light a curious anomaly. On what principle of equity, I wonder, did Governor Hennessey act when he appointed these four Chinese turnkeys. Were they so immensely superior men to those who had been five or six years in the service as to merit an increased wage of from six to eleven dollars over that being paid? I have never heard that such was the case. While these four Chinese have \$30, which is a fortune to men of their class, the two hospital warders have to be content with \$35 and \$25 respectively; the first class assistant turnkeys get \$20 per month, and the second \$15. The difficulty a European has in living on \$25 a month is known best to those who have to do it, and there are at least two European employees in the goal who have to solve this problem. I may mention that the pay of a Chinese Police Sergeant ranges from \$20 to \$25; that of a constable from \$10 to \$14. The contrast between the rates of pay strikes one at a glance, but the reason why such a contrast should exist is by no means so apparent. Can you inform me what the peculiar qualifications possessed by these Chinese are? I wonder they are more competent to perform the duties required of them than the lower paid men, and whether, when they were engaged, it was found necessary to offer \$36 to induce them to enter the service? If these questions can only be answered negatively, then the other employees have been most unfairly treated, and no one can be surprised at their grumbling.—I am, &c.

ENQUIRER.

[The status and duties of the four Chinese and first-class assistant turnkeys above referred to are the same in every respect, and the Chinese are in no way more competent than the lower-paid and older servants. One difference there is in the terms of engagement, namely, that the Chinese when engaged had to give security for \$500. This the other turnkeys are not called upon to do. Instead of entrusting them to a higher rate of wages as trustworthy men, this rather seems to cast a doubt upon their integrity.—Ed. C. M.]

SUPREME COURT.

IN SUMMARY JURISDICTION.

(Before the Hon. F. Swinden, Principal Judge.)

Tuesday, August 15.

TAKEO U N C. J. M. GURDEN JR. AND

The plaintiff was present, but was not represented by counsel. Mr. Johnson, of Messrs. Sharp, Toller and Johnson, appeared for Mr. Gurden; the other defendants did not appear.

The plaintiff stated that he claimed the above sum in payment of five cases of blue jeans which he had supplied to the defendant, who had been supplied to the defendant by the defendant's partner, the partners of which were, Isaacson, from the Registrar-General's Office, Mr. Gurden, Chan Ching Po and Mo Hok Ling.

Cross-examined by Mr. Johnson, he said the cases were supplied on the order of the defendant, which was signed by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

Mr. Johnson stated that the defence was that Mr. Gurden was not a partner. The plaintiff was proceeding entirely upon the registration, required by Ordinance 7 of 1866. Although Mr. Gurden's name had appeared as a householder of the Po Hong for a short time, it had been put to him by one of the servants of the Po Hong firm, the partner of which he did not know at the time he received the order. He had only made Mr. Gurden one of the defendants after making enquiries at the Registrar-General's Office; previous to making these enquiries he had no information that Mr. Gurden was a partner in the firm.

name had been registered until he learned it in Mr. Wotton's Office; he had never had any transaction with the plaintiff, although Mr. Wotton and another defendant were, by letters to Messrs. Siemens & Co. and Mr. Balfour, the Postmaster-General, that he had only acted as Agent for the steamer through-out.

Mr. Charles Omond, of the Registrar-General's Department, produced the book in which the particulars registered for the Registration of Householders were entered. In this book an entry, dated the 1st June 1892, appeared in which the names of Mr. J. M. Gurden, Chan Ching Po and Mo Hok Ling were registered at the Po Hong, ship chandler, Bankman Street. He also produced the form in which these particulars were supplied, signed by Chan Ching Po. Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

Mr. Omond said that on the morning of the 3rd instant, Mr. Gurden accompanied by Chan Ching Po and another man, came to the office, and Mr. Gurden accused Chan Ching Po of having falsely registered him as a partner of the Po Hong.

